# orders

|       | 1      | 2      | 3     | 4    |
|-------|--------|--------|-------|------|
| 21-24 | 6,308  | 424    | 40    | 8    |
| 24-34 | 53,886 | 6,020  | 848   | 132  |
| 35-44 | 41,424 | 6,107  | 939   | 196  |
| 45-54 | 22,510 | 3,803  | 621   | 157  |
| 55+   | 18,324 | 3,499  | 630   | 152  |

#'s having miscoding

| Based on 1 item by item | 142,452 | 19,853 | 3,078 | 645 |

| Based on # order | 142,440 | 17,322 | 2,463 | 464 | ← GOOD #'s

| add age/sex var | 142,452 | 19,609 | 3,019 | 620 |

The discrepancies in the totals is due to miscoding. For example, among those who placed 1 order there were 12 responders whose records [item] orders showed them as female in one record & unknown in the order record. It appears that the problem is compounded among those with 2 orders, 3 orders & 4+ orders. The only solution would be to correct these miscodes but a decision has to be made as to what order to code unknowns.

I hope this answers your question.

| diff. | 12 | 2,534 | 615 | 181 |